

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Will in view of Maurille.

Claims 1, 2, and 7-10 are amended, and, thus, claims 1-10 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

REJECTION

Elected and pending claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Will (US Patent No. 6,721,410) in view of Maurille (US Patent No. 6,484,196). Maurille is newly cited, and, thus, newly relied upon.

The independent claims are 1, 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Will discloses a matchmaking apparatus where "user A determines that user B is a person that is likely to be interesting enough so as to get involved in a casual collaborative conversation with that person. That is, if user A believes that he or she shares common interests with user B, user A will engage in collaborative conferencing with user B. This determination is made after obtaining information about user B. **The information is obtained by communicating with user B.** The manner in which user A communicates with user B in order to determine whether he or she is likely to be interested in communicating with user B (possibly via some other communication means or links) includes, but is not limited to, **telephonic conversations, e-mail, voice mail, real-time video, and real-time text**" (Will, column 3, lines 51-64). In other words, user A initially meets and learns information about **a user B by actually conversing with user B.**

Will further discloses "Unlike conventional methods of matchmaking in a chat room context, user A does not rely on a computer program to pick interesting persons for him or her. Instead, **user A relies on user B's personal directory 20 as a starting point to find more interesting persons.** User A accesses some of the information contained in directory 20 about

other users with collaborative conferencing capability, with whom user B communicates. This technique is called recursive identification of individuals. The information that user A can access is limited according to permissions assigned to each record in the directory by user B" (Will, column 4, lines 1-17). In other words, once User A has met User B, with whom User A shares a common interest, User A can look in User B's personal directory, which could disclose other users which with User B converses with. Thus, Will discloses a matchmaking system where **once a first user finds a second user whom the first user likes by actually conversing with that second user**, the first user can look in the second user's **personal directory**, which presumably, would contain **names of other users** with potentially similar interests whom the first user may also like and the second user has personally added to the second user's personal directory.

However, Will fails to teach or suggest the claimed present invention's:

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A **profile creation** method . . . comprising the steps of:

providing predetermined keywords and predetermined categories such that the keywords and categories are correlated to each other;

monitoring whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords;

identifying a category that corresponds to a keyword if the message sent to the virtual space contains the keyword, according to the monitoring; and

storing the identified category such that the category is correlated to a user who sent the message to the virtual space.

Will discloses "[t]he [personal] directory 20 contains individual records 300-304 that correspond to individuals with collaborative conferencing capability . . . Records 300-304 contain user information that includes, but is not limited to, users' e-mail address, users' names and virtual space room login names, picture id's, etc" (Will, column 4, lines 18-26). In other words, Will discloses a user directory which contains **identifying** information of people with which the user has personally conversed with and who may potentially have similar interests. A first user can browse a second user's personal directory, when the first user discovers that he or she has a common interest with the second user **after actually conversing with them**, and potentially find people with similar interests. However, because the personal directory lists user's names

and other **identification** information, the first user would have no way of knowing if the other users in the directory share common interests, because User A does not know of conversations between second user and the second user's personal directory users. For example, if User A and User B have interest X in common and User B and User C have interest Y in common, User A would look in User B's directory and would find User C, but User A and User C would have no common interest. Will discloses a directory of names of people with potentially similar interests and thus fails to teach or suggest the claimed present invention's, "[a] **profile creation method . . . providing predetermined keywords and predetermined categories** such that the keywords and categories are correlated to each other; **monitoring whether a message** sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords; **identifying a category** that corresponds to a keyword if the message sent to the virtual space contains the keyword, according to the monitoring; and storing the identified category such that **the category is correlated to a user who sent the message to the virtual space.**"

The Office Action acknowledges (on page 3, lines 1-3) that Will fails to disclose the claimed present invention's, "monitoring whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords," as recited in claim 1. So, the Examiner newly relies upon Maurille to disclose the claimed present invention's feature, "**monitoring whether a message** sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords."

Maurille discloses that "[w]henver a user participates in a thread--that is, when he is a sender or recipient (even if only a CC recipient)--an entry is made by the server application 114 in the thread participants table 148. This table facilitates the gathering of message threads by subject for a given user. For example, the server application 114 would gather such information for a particular user by: 1) issuing a query in the ThreadParticipants table 148 to find ThreadIds of all threads a user with a particular UserID has participated in; 2) issuing a query in the Threads table 146 using the ThreadIDs from query 1 to identify the subject sort numbers (SubjectASCI) for the respective threads; and 3) issuing a query in the Messages table 142 with the SubjectASCI values from query 2) to identify all messages with the same subject for the user" (Maurille, column 9, lines 16-33). Therefore, Maurille discusses that the subject line of a thread is stored when a user sends or receives a message and that the subject line is a field in **which a user would enter information** to tell the recipient what the message is about - i.e. the subject of the message (see, for example, Maurille, FIG. 3A, element 162 and column 8, table

142, "Subject - Message subject or conference name").

However, Maurille fails to describe that the SubjectASCI is determined based upon its stored MsgTxts 136 (column 10, lines 1-17). In view of column 8, table 142, Subject and SubjectASCI and column 9, lines 15-33, Maurille identifies messages with the same subject for the user based upon the subject field of message table 142, and not based upon Maurille's stored MsgTxt 136. Therefore, Maurille fails to teach or suggest the claimed present invention's, **"monitoring whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords."** In other words, Maurille fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's message attribute data based upon monitoring content or body of a virtual space message, as shown in FIG. 3 of the present Application and discussed, for example, in page 16, line 8 to page 17, line 20, of the present Application.

The Office Action in page 3, provides that Maurille, column 4, lines 41-51, column 9, lines 56-67 and column 10, lines 1-17 discloses "an Internet messaging system that determines if a URL (keyword) is included in the message sent to a user which is stored in the users table." However, these Maurille description references do not mention the phrase "URL (keyword) is included in the message," because Maurille mentions "MsgTxt" only in column 10, lines 22-24, but fails to describe its use. The Office Action appears to assert that Maurille "implicitly discloses monitoring whether a message sent to virtual space contains at least one of the keywords." However, Maurille cannot support an implicit disclosure of using its "MsgTxt" to identify keywords therein, because Maurille is silent on using keywords anywhere and is silent on searching its saved "MsgTxt," so Maurille cannot capture the claimed present invention's, **"monitoring whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords"** as part of "storing the identified category such that **the category is correlated to a user who sent the message to the virtual space**" to create **"a profile"** for the user.

More particularly, Maurille discusses sending a message including a URL and performing an electronic conference. Therefore, although, Maurille discusses transmitting a message including a keyword, however, Maurille does not disclose a configuration to monitor whether or not a URL is included in a message, because in Maurille, a URL (corresponding to an example of a keyword in the claimed present invention) is always included in a message sent from a user terminal to a server via HTTP protocol. This is shown in Maurille's Fig. 3A (see message 3.2). That the URL is always included in the message means that it is not necessary to monitor

whether or not the URL is included in the message. Therefore, Maurille teaches away from the claimed present invention's configuration to monitor whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords. The claimed present invention cannot be obvious from a combination of such Maurille and Will, because Will fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention and Maurille fails to disclose or provide any motivation to modify Will to provide the claimed present invention's, "***monitoring whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords; identifying a category*** that corresponds to a keyword if the message sent to the virtual space contains the keyword, ***according to the monitoring***," as part of "storing the identified category such that ***the category is correlated to a user who sent the message to the virtual space***," which provides a benefit of providing a "***profile***" for the user. Maurille fails to provide any motivation to modify Will to achieve the claimed present invention, because Maurille fails to contemplate the present invention's benefit of creating a "***profile***" for a user based upon "***monitoring whether a message sent to a virtual space contains at least one of the keywords; identifying a category*** that corresponds to a keyword if the message sent to the virtual space contains the keyword, ***according to the monitoring***."

For example, using claim 2 as an example, a combined system of Will and Maurille fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's:

2. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A profile creation system for use in a conversation system having a plurality of terminal devices that can exchange messages among each other, the plurality of terminal devices being connected to a network and sharing one of a plurality of virtual conversation spaces formed on the network, said profile creation system comprising:

a category table in which predetermined keywords and predetermined categories are stored such that the keywords and categories are correlated to each other;

a user table that stores users, predetermined keywords sent by the user via messages, and the categories, such that the users, keywords, and categories are correlated to one another; and

administration means for ***monitoring in the conversation system a message sent to a conversation space***, determining based on said category table a category that corresponds to a keyword ***if the message contains the keyword according to the monitoring***, and ***writing in said user table a sender of the message, the keyword in the message, and the determined category*** (emphasis added).


Thus, Will and Maurille fail to teach or suggest the above-discussed claimed features of independent claims 1, 2 and 7-10 and in view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 5, 2005

By: 
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501